Exhibit 1

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 10904-1 Filed: 07/09/21 Entered: 07/09/21 16:01:07 Page 1 of 3



March 2, 2018

Ms. Sandra Pedroia 801 Athens Avenue San Francisco, CA 94112

Re: 2011 Water Line Leak Claim #2011301096

Dear Ms. Pedroia:

This letter is in response to your email concerns dated January 23, 26, and 31, 2018, to PG&E's Tony Earley, your February 2, 2018 communication addressed to President and CEO Geisha Williams and your February 28, 2018 communication to PG&E's General Counsel, John Simon.

On February 9, 2011, PG&E received your initial claim advising your water line was damaged on January 18, 2011 as a result of a gas line replacement project performed by PG&E. Your claim was immediately investigated by both PG&E and the San Francisco Water Department. In spite of the water department's statement that your water leak was likely due to natural wear and tear of old galvanized pipes, PG&E honored your claim and agreed to pay San Francisco Plumbing \$3,200 to replace your existing water line. In March of 2011, you reached out to PG&E officers Sandy Hartman, Helen Burt and Christopher Johns requesting that PG&E reimburse you an additional \$5,000 for being without water during the water line replacement. As a gesture of goodwill PG&E hand delivered a \$1,000 check to your home to compensate you for the inconvenience associated with being without water. At that time you destroyed the check because you were unsatisfied with the settlement offered.

On June 9, 2011 PG&E's Vice President and Managing Director of Law, Sandy Hartman, issued you \$6,200 in full settlement of your claim. In late 2012 you began reaching out to PG&E's Customer Relations Director, Lavern Mitchell, alleging that you were unsatisfied with the resolution of your claim and now believed the 2011 water line damage also caused damage to your stair rail and a flag of concrete located on the sidewalk. Over the course of 2012 and 2013 you worked directly with PG&E's Shelly Sharp to address those concerns. Ms. Sharp advanced Diodati Construction \$2,000 towards their \$3,200 proposal to repair your stairs. You were unsatisfied with Diodati Construction so you elected to retain MJ Avila Company to perform the stair repairs for a significantly higher bid of \$8,875.35. In order to resolve your concern PG&E advanced MJ Avila \$3,000 to commence work. Unfortunately, you were also unsatisfied with the work performed by your elected contractor, so you terminated them June 18, 2013. During 2013 Ms. Sharp asked you numerous times to select a contractor that you were comfortable working with to have your stairs repaired to your satisfaction.

In summary PG&E has paid a total of \$15,400 between 2011 and 2013 to amicably resolve your 2011 water damage claim (\$7,200 directly to you and \$8,200 to various contractors). We believe that PG&E has made every effort to address all of your concerns associated with your 2011 water leak claim. Although the three year statute of limitations under California law to file

1 | Page

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 10904-1 Filed: 07/09/21 Entered: 07/09/21 16:01:07 Page 2

a property damage claim with a court of law has passed, PG&E will agree to participate in and pay for mediation to allow both parties the opportunity to have an independent third party arbitrator review and attempt to resolve this dispute. Enclosed for your review is a November 29, 2016 letter issued to you by PG&E's Managing Counsel, Stephen Schirle, explaining mediation to you and offering mediation to address a separate billing dispute you presented to PG&E.

I hope that you understand PG&E has made our very best effort to resolve your 2011 claim. At this time if you remain unsatisfied with our resolution attempts, we urge you to work with us to schedule mediation.

Sincerely,

Renee Giammalvo Claims Manager 6111 Bollinger Canyon Road San Ramon, CA 94583 (925) 380-7058

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 10904-1 Filed: 07/09/21 Entered: 07/09/21 16:01:07 Page 3

2 | Page